The Chicago Tribune.

VOL. 24. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1871. NO. 246.

The demand for THE SUNDAY TRIBUNE is so large, both because of its entertaining and instructive reading matter, and the unusual number of its advertisements, which make it a business directory of the city, that it is absolutely necessary we should go to press at an early hour that the paper may be issued in season for prompt delivery. We, therefore, again urge upon advertisers to hand in their favors as early as possible, that there may be sufficient time for their proper classification, and that they may not be omitted for want of time to put them in type before the hour at which we are compelled to go to press.

WASHINGTON.

The House Ku-Klux Bill Referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Senator Morrill, of Vermont, Delivers His Anti-Sac Domingo Speech.

Senate Resolution Adopted for the Appointment of a Southern Investigating Committee.

Prospect of an Executive Session of the Senate for Executive Business.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.

WASHINGTON, April 7, via Lexington, Ky., April 8.—The long-looked-for speech on the Dominican question was delivered to-day to a good audience by Senator Morrill, of Vermont, in advocacy of that he should call the Anti-Annexation bill. Mr. Morrill said that the question of the annexation of Dominica to the United States was a question of very great importance, and one which he had pressed upon the attention of the Senate for consideration, very strongly that general policy of the administration concerning the acquisition of foreign territory, and added that, if pursuance to it, it would give the great republic the reputation of a grossly insatiate and unscrupulous land-grabber and robber, who paid Mr. North, the closest attention, and who caught the drift of the argument of Mr. Morrill's speech, and the indefensible character of the annexation scheme. Mr. Morrill said that his motives

The Chicago Tribune.

Published Every Morning (Except Monday) and Every Evening.

Daily Edition, Morning Only, per year $12.00
Daily Edition, Morning Only, per month 1.00
Daily Edition, Morning and Evening, per year 15.00
Daily Edition, Morning and Evening, per month 1.25
Weekly Tribune, One Copy, per year 2.50
Semi-Weekly Tribune, One Copy, per year 5.00

Postage to Subscribers in the United States.

The Morning Edition will be delivered to any part of the City of Chicago, or sent by Mail, at $8 per year; $4 for six months; $2 for three months; or 75 cents per month.

The Evening Edition will be delivered to any part of the City of Chicago, or sent by Mail, at $6 per year; $3 for six months; $1.50 for three months; or 50 cents per month.

The Morning and Evening Editions will be delivered to any part of the City of Chicago, or sent by Mail, at $15 per year; $7.50 for six months; $3.75 for three months; or 75 cents per month.

Weekly Tribune, One Copy, per year 2.50
Semi-Weekly Tribune, One Copy, per year 5.00
Tribune Building, Cor. Dearborn and Madison-sts. 15.00

Postage to Subscribers in the United States.

The Weekly Tribune will be delivered, Post Office postage in the United States, at one copy per year for $2.50; two copies for $4; three copies for $5; four copies for $7.50; five copies for $9; ten copies for $15.00.

The Semi-Weekly Tribune will be delivered, Post Office postage in the United States, at one copy per year for $5; two copies for $8; three copies for $10.

Remittances should be made by Post Office order, or in registered letters, at our risk.

Address all letters and telegrams for information or subscription to THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, Chicago, Ill.

Address all communications for publication to the Editor of THE TRIBUNE.

Address all business letters to THE TRIBUNE COMPANY.

Offices, 15 and 17 Tribune Building, Chicago, Ill.

SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1871.

The demand for THE SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE is so large, both because of its interesting and instructive reading matter, and the immense variety of its advertising matter which makes it a thorough directory of the city, that it is absolutely necessary we should go to press at an early hour, that the paper may be ready for mailing next morning. We, therefore, hope our friends will make it a habit to hand in their communications as early as possible, that there may be sufficient time for their proper insertion, and that they may not be crowded for room at the last moment. To this before the hour at which we are compelled to go to press.

THE STATE HOUSE SWINDLE.

The debate on the State House Appropriation bill has brought to light some things that seem to justify the opposition to this bill, or the appropriation of any money money now and the completion of the structure until after the next session of the Legislature is had into the management of the ground Board of Commissioners. Mr. King of Jersey one of those who had been most active in the matter, stated that there had been expended, or otherwise disposed of, out of the $465,000 of public money already taken from the Treasury, for the erection of the State House, only $465,000 had actually gone into the building. The remainder, $340,000, had been squandered, or otherwise disposed of, and there was nothing to show for it. Mr. King pronounced the report of the Committee on Public Buildings, in regard to the State House, as a wilfully deceptive, whitewashing report, made for the purpose of concealing from the Legislature the infamous use that had been wantonly or corruptly expended. The committee reported the value of labor and materials in position, and had not called for persons or papers, and their report was worthless. Mr. King proceeded to show that the Commissioners had each drawn $5.00 per day for their services as Commissioners, and, in addition, they had paid lawyers $5,000. They had employed the architect with a salary of $10,000 per annum, in addition to his fees or expenses in that line at the cost of the State, when he was deemed a sinecure for the purpose of paying him $10,000 per annum, the money already expended, and the millions yet to be expended on the structure. He thought that was enough without further particulars for which reference to the report is made. If the Commissioners got pay for every day's work, they ought to work, and not sit in their chairs and employ other men to perform their duties at the expense of the State. Mr. King said that the charge of $10 per thousand for brick in the piers in place of iron was unnecessary, and had been made at an extravagant of $6,000 to the Treasury. He proceeded to make other exposures equally damaging to the Commissioners, letting by light on the way the money goes. Another member gave it as his belief that portions of the State House would tumble down, so bad was the workmanship and so inferior the mortar that had been used. The whole of the work condemned some of the arches and inner walls unsafe. Members who doubted these statements visited the work, and, upon inspection, became convinced of the truth of the charges, and avowed on the floor of the House that, unless the law for any further appropriation until a thorough investigation had been first made by disinterested practical builders. Notwithstanding all these damaging exposures, the Appropriation bill could not be passed. The State House ring are not to be baffled in their purposes by such objections as those raised by Mr. King. The same means that carried the first appropriation will be employed to carry the second. The House is full of members susceptible to those controlling arguments which the ring know how to employ. The more opposition is made to the appropriation, the more money will be required to silence it. Hence the Illinois House of Representatives will vote to-day, and the High Commissioners and the rural Democrats of whom, but cannot prevent the passage of the bill, no matter what waste, peculation, or mismanagement may be shown to exist, nor whether the building may not tumble down before it is completed.

The opposition to the Appropriation bill is delaying all the other business before the House, but cannot defeat it. The last dollar of the $4,500,000 to which the constitution limits the expenditures for the State House will be expended, whether the building is completed or not. The money will all be drawn from the Treasury and disposed of, and perhaps the sooner the better. No opposition in the Legislature will ever avail to arrest embezzlement or dishonest expenditure of the funds for the reason that the $3,500,000 furnished the banks to stifle investigation, or prevent whitewashing reports, and to carry appropriation bills while a dollar of the final remains subject to draft by bill or otherwise.

Why, then, spend any more time in fruitless efforts to defeat the bill? Better let it pass, in order that the House may proceed with the consideration of the bills whose passage at this session is an urgent necessity.

MORE AMNESTY.

Among the measures of the present Congress is one offered by Gen. Robert C. De Large, a colored man, representing the Charleston District of South Carolina. In a speech delivered by him on Thursday, on the Ku-Klux bill, he put on the very anxious North ern mind a new and unexpected view by showing by his references and illustrations well which he discussed the subject. He stated that he represented a district in which there had been no outrages since the adoption of the constitutional amendments. He freely admitted that both parties were responsible for whatever disturbance there is now in South Carolina, and thought that some legislation was necessary; but, that the whole body of the rightminded citizens, under political disabilities were relieved. He insisted that Republicans could not expect that those now voting against universal disfranchisement would support measures to preserve the public peace when they have nothing to hope from its establishment.

It would be unfortunate, did Gen. De Large more than one Republican Senator, during the recent debate, the peace could be restored in every village and district of the South by the moderate party would be after it, that which is still the best element in the South, and abandon their practices, give up drinking and swearing, join the church, and become model citizens of Kentucky, then would be no Ku-Klux. But Mr. De Large's remedy for the Democratic malice in the South cannot be expected to take effect rapidly enough to prevent the passage of the bill, no matter what may be shown to exist, nor whether

THE LAW COURTS.

Decision Rendered to an Important Admiralty Case.

Is it "Customary" to Go to the Relief of Shipwrecked Vessels?

Judge Blodgett Not a Success as a Hotel-Keeper.

United States Circuit Court.

A CASE ENDED BY A LAW-SUIT.

In the case of T. Perry Van Every and others against the Peninsula Insurance Company of Rhode Island, New York, the Court instructed the jury to return a verdict for defendant. Although the indemnifying ship-rights, the Jay Hood, and the insured cotton about three-quarters of an hour after they obeyed the instructions.

This case is one of importance since the jury came into court on Tuesday; and this trial was the third time the case had been presented, and on the two previous occasions the jury had gone out and failed to agree. Several questions arose in the legal points involved, and the Court was compelled to reserve upon a point of law which, if decided one way or another, would practically settle the case. The point was whether the Court should charge the jury that the policy was void because the vessel was not seaworthy at the time the risk was taken, or whether it should charge that the policy was void because the vessel was not seaworthy at the time the loss occurred. The Court decided that the latter was the correct rule, and charged the jury accordingly. The jury, however, could not agree upon a verdict, and were discharged. The case will be tried at the next term of the Court.

Mr. Ashmun is for plaintiff; Messrs. Goudy & Ayer for defendant.

Circuit Court.

VERDICT AGAINST THE CITY.

In the case of Thomas Mosers against the City, a verdict was rendered in favor of plaintiff for $1,000. The plaintiff received his injuries by falling into a hole in Kinzie street at the intersection of Rush, the jury were told that the city was damages. A former jury had rendered a verdict in favor of the city, which was set aside.

INJUNCTION GRANTED.

An injunction was granted restraining the heirs of John Clark Hilton, to prevent John Hold and Oscar Hilton from selling the property left by the deceased. The property is situated on Clark street, and was left by Hilton to a daughter now a minor, and, in the event of her death, to the heirs. It is Block No. 13 in South Section Addition, and the machinery and appurtenances thereto belonging.

ANOTHER INJUNCTION.

An action of like nature was commenced by Lonzini D. Perry against H. Byron Hitz, the dock having been leased by the latter to the former for the term of five years, at a rental of $1,000 per annum. This is all duly brought against defendant as a speculation, and that he has leased the dock to the Mining Company, the sum of a judgment heretofore rendered against him.

EXCHANGE'S SUIT.

Exchange's suit for $1,000 against Wm. Hoffman is decided in favor of plaintiff. The defendant moved for a new trial, but the motion was overruled, and judgment entered on the verdict. The defendant excepted, and will carry the case to the Supreme Court.

Superior Court.

In the case of Mary Ann Sweet and Thomas Dutton, against William Hinrichsen, a grain broker, the jury rendered a verdict for plaintiff, who was awarded the penalty of $2,000, the amount of the bond given by defendant.

The question raised by the defendant was that the bond was given to the firm of Sweet & Co., and that the plaintiff, Sweet, composed the firm, and could not sue himself. The Court decided against him for all other.

The jury also rendered that, if that firm existed at the time, and not the present firm of Sweet & Co., then the plaintiff was entitled to recover. In the case of Thomas Dutton, the jury found for plaintiff in the sum of $1,000. The defendant moved for a new trial, which was overruled, and judgment entered on the verdict. The defendant excepted, and will carry the case to the Supreme Court.

Judge Blodgett Not a Success as a Hotel-Keeper.

The case of Thomas Mosers against the City, which was tried before Judge Blodgett, and resulted in a verdict for plaintiff for $1,000, was brought before Judge Porter this morning on motion for a new trial. The motion was based on the ground that the verdict was against the evidence, and that the damages were excessive. The motion was overruled, and judgment entered on the verdict. The defendant excepted, and will carry the case to the Supreme Court.

Judge Porter then proceeded to hear the motion for a new trial in the case of Mary Ann Sweet against William Hinrichsen, which was argued and submitted yesterday. To the first count, charging the defendant with the penalty of the bond, he filed a demurrer, and to the second, charging him with a breach of the bond, he filed a plea of non est factum. The plaintiff replied to the plea, and issue was joined. The case was then submitted to the Court, and the jury discharged from the further consideration of the case.

Probate Court.

Judge Porter this morning granted letters of administration on the estate of Mary Ann Sweet, deceased, to Henry J. Goodrich, the widow of the deceased, in lieu of Thomas Dutton, who declined to act.

Circuit Court.

The following business was transacted:

Judgments were entered for services between Sarah A. Hall, plaintiff, and Mary Ann Sweet and others, of Blocks 2, 4, 7, and the west half of Block 8, in Canal Trustees' Subdivision of the west half of the north-east quarter of section 9, 39, 14, east of the third principal meridian, and the west half of the north-west quarter of section 10, 39, 14, east of the third principal meridian, in Cook County.

Captain Corp. of Engineers U. S. A.

U. S. Engineer's Office,
MILWAUKEE, WIS., April 1, 1871.

Sealed proposals will be received at this office until 12 M. on the 15th day of May, 1871, for furnishing all the labor and materials for the construction of a pier at Sheboygan Harbor, Wis., in accordance with plans and specifications to be seen at this office.

For all information apply to this office.

The right is reserved to reject any or all proposals received.

Proposals must be made on forms furnished from this office.

Captain Corps of Engineers U. S. A.

U. S. Engineer's Office,
MILWAUKEE, WIS., April 1, 1871.

Sealed proposals will be received at this office until 12 M. on the 15th day of May, 1871, for furnishing all the labor and materials for the construction of a pier at Port Washington, Wis., in accordance with plans and specifications to be seen at this office.

For all information apply to this office.

The right is reserved to reject any or all proposals received.

Proposals must be made on forms furnished from this office.

Captain Corps of Engineers U. S. A.

United States Engineer's Office,
CHICAGO,

TERRIBLE TRAGEDY.

A Prominent Physician Shot and Instantly Killed by His Brother-in-Law.

Domestic Difficulties Said to be the Cause of the Fearful Penalty.

Statement of the Fratricide—He Declares that He Acted in Self-Defense.

Last evening, about 5 o'clock, a tragedy was enacted on the West Side, which, from the circumstances connected with it, and the prominence of the parties to it, will cause a thrill of horror to run through the community. Dr. Edward Lawrence, who resided at No. 170 Carroll street, was shot and instantly killed by his brother-in-law, Mr. Frederick Lovejoy, who resides in the house adjoining. The shooting occurred in the front room of the latter house, and was witnessed by Mrs. Lovejoy, the wife of the murderer, and by Mrs. Dr. Lawrence, a young woman well known in this city for her beauty, her many virtues, and her sad misfortunes. Dr. Lawrence, who was about 30 years of age, was married to Miss Lovejoy, the daughter of Mr. Frederick Lovejoy, about three years ago, and from the first there was trouble between the husband and wife. Dr. Lawrence was a young physician well known in this city for his skill in his profession, his genial manners, and his many good traits of character. He lived happily with his wife for a few months, working and toiling for her support, until the fatal habit of intemperance fastened itself upon him. Then his character changed, and he became a confirmed drunkard. He would remain away from home for days together, and would then return in a beastly state of intoxication. He would then abuse his wife in the most shameful manner, and on several occasions struck her. Finally he left her entirely, and refused to support her. Mrs. Lawrence, who is a lady of refinement and culture, was thus left to support herself by her own exertions, and she went to work with a will, and succeeded in obtaining a good position as teacher in the Foster School, on Lake street, near Halsted. Here she remained, and was doing well, when her husband, who had been absent for a long time, returned to the city, and began to annoy her with his presence. He would call at the school, and insist upon seeing her, and would follow her home. Last evening he called at the house, and was refused admittance by Mrs. Lovejoy, who was afraid of him. He then went to the house of Mr. Lovejoy, and entered the front room, where Mrs. Lovejoy and Mrs. Lawrence were sitting. He was very much excited, and commenced abusing Mrs. Lovejoy for refusing him admittance to her house. Mr. Lovejoy, who was in the rear room, hearing the disturbance, came forward, and ordered Lawrence to leave the house. Lawrence refused to do so, and Mr. Lovejoy then attempted to put him out. Lawrence struggled with him, and drew a pistol, with which he shot Lovejoy in the left breast, the ball passing through the heart. Lovejoy fell to the floor, and Lawrence then turned the pistol upon himself, and fired a ball into his head, which caused instant death. Lovejoy lived but a few minutes after the shooting. Lawrence's body was taken to the undertaking establishment of Mr. Kinsley, on Halsted street, near Madison, and Lovejoy's body was taken to his residence.

Mr. Lovejoy, who is a man of about 45 years of age, and is well known in this city, was seen at his residence last night by a reporter of the TRIBUNE, and made the following statement of the affair:

"I was sitting in the front room, with my wife and Mrs. Lawrence, when Lawrence came to the door and rang the bell. I went to the door and opened it, when Lawrence pushed me back into the room. He then began abusing my wife and Mrs. Lawrence in the most shameful manner, and I ordered him to leave the house. He refused to do so, and I then attempted to put him out. He struggled with me, and drew a pistol, with which he shot me in the left breast. I fell to the floor, and he then turned the pistol upon himself, and fired a ball into his head, which caused instant death. I was not aware that he had a pistol in his possession, and I did not think that he intended to shoot me. I had not spoken to him for some time, and I had no idea that he would attempt to do me any harm. I was not armed, and I had no weapon with which to defend myself. I was shot in self-defense, and I am sorry that I was compelled to kill him. He was a man of violent temper, and I have had much trouble with him. He has been in the habit of coming to the house and abusing my wife and Mrs. Lawrence, and I have frequently ordered him out of the house. He was a man of violent temper, and I was afraid that he would kill my wife. I have been married to Miss Lovejoy about three years, and have lived with her happily until Lawrence returned to the city